

## Geographic Review Panel 4 – San Joaquin River

**Proposal number:** 2001-F209

**Short Proposal Title:** Evaluation of BAC as  
Selenium Indicator

**1. Applicability to CALFED ERP Goals and Implementation Plan and CVPIA priorities, and relevance to ERP and CVPIA priorities for your region.** Panel agrees with Staff Review: proposal has potential benefit for Goals 1 and 6 of ERP (less so for Goal 4), and also complements CVPIA objectives. Selenium is an important issue in the San Joaquin region. The proposed work has the potential to contribute to the important goal of defining site specific selenium standards.

**2. Linkages/coordination with previously funded projects or other restoration activities in your region.** Staff correctly noted the many links between this proposal and numerous past and current CALFED-funded projects.

**3. Feasibility, especially the project's ability to move forward in a timely and successful manner.** Panel agrees with TARP conclusion that completion of Tasks 1 and 2 can be anticipated; Task 3 is problematic.

**4. Qualifications of the applicants and others involved in implementing the proposed project.** Panel agrees with TARP – applicants are well qualified to accomplish Tasks 1 and 2, expertise for Task 3 is lacking.

**5. Local involvement (including environmental compliance).** No proposed outreach, but not important for this type of research project.

**6. Cost.** Reasonable, budget thorough.

**7. Cost sharing.** None.

**8. Additional comments.** Panel questions TARP's ranking and conclusions given the independent reviewer comments and the Panel's understanding of the proposal. In particular, this Panel believes that funding for Objectives 1 and 2 has merit.

---

### Regional Ranking

**Panel Ranking:** Medium

**Provide a brief explanation of your ranking:** Selenium is an important issue in the San Joaquin region. The proposed work has the potential to contribute to the important goal of defining site specific selenium standards. Panel questions TARP's ranking and conclusions given the independent reviewer comments and the Panel's understanding of the proposal. In particular, this Panel believes that funding for Objectives 1 and 2 has merit.